

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

GREGORY KELLY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN  
POLICE DEPARTMENT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-02074-LRH-CWH

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Produce or Inspect Documents (#36), filed March 18, 2013.


The Court has reviewed the motion. It is not a motion to compel, rather it appears Plaintiff has filed his Rule 34 discovery requests. Pursuant to Local Rule 26-8, "[u]nless other ordered by the Court, written discovery . . . shall not be filed with the Court." The Court has not ordered that discovery be filed. Even *pro se* litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules. *E.g. King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987); *see also Jacobsen v. Filler*, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364 (9th Cir. 1986) ("pro se litigants in the ordinary civil case should not be treated more favorable than parties with attorneys of record"); *Carter v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986) (pro se litigants expected to abide by the rules of the court in which litigation proceeds). Plaintiff is instructed to serve his discovery requests pursuant to the Federal Rules.

Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing therefore,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Produce or Inspect Documents

1 (#36) is **denied**.

2 DATED this 20th day of March, 2013.

3  
4   
5 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**  
6 **United States Magistrate Judge**  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28